

III. *Observations on Two of Gravenhorst's Subgenera of Ichneumons, namely, Macrus, forming the Fifth Family of Ophion, and Coleocentrus, the Fourth Family of Banchus.* By THOMAS DESVIGNES, Esq.

[Read 4th June, 1849.]

I HAVE brought with me two insects for exhibition, which I captured in an unfinished building in Vienna; and at the time I considered to be the sexes of one species; since then closer investigation has convinced me in this particular. Their palpi and venuration of the wings perfectly correspond, independent of other minor points. Gravenhorst makes no mention of the construction of the former. The maxillary palpi consist of five articulations: the basal short; 2nd, stout, reniform; 3rd and 4th, slightly subclavate; the 5th filiform, the apex somewhat mucronate, their comparative lengths 5, 3, $\frac{4}{3}$, 1. The second articulation of the labial palpi cylindrical, and a little longer than broad, incurved, and stouter than the rest; all are setose. The antennæ of the male are setaceous, those of the female filiform; the joints of the latter lay parallel, but obliquely one to the other, and are longer than in the ♂, of which the specimen here exhibited agrees perfectly with Gravenhorst's *Macrus longiventris*, and the female with his *Coleocentrus excitator*.

The specific characters in these two subgenera are scarcely distinct, with the exception in the form of the abdomen. In referring to the generic descriptions as given by Gravenhorst, their difference consists in the form of the scutellum, which in *Coleocentrus* is triangular, and in *Macrus* subquadrangular; the basal abdominal segments, and the eighth or apical ones in both, agree in form, the latter in the ♀ is more reflexed than in the ♂.

The vomeriform appendage in the ♀ is stated by Gravenhorst to have its origin from the sixth ventral segment; but upon closer examination it appears to me to consist of three counter segments, the first arising from the apex of the third ventral segment. This may be erroneous, and arising only from the greater production of the ordinary segments. In *Arotes* and *Acoenites*, the ♀ of which are similarly constructed, this appears to be the case, and forms a continuation of the ventral carina, but the upper and lower margins of the segments of —? *excitator* do not coincide as in the two last genera; this has led me to come to the former conclusion as regards that insect.

It seems presumptuous to say that so able an author as the one quoted should be in error; but in this instance, from the apparent disparity of the sexes (still not greater than in some of the fossorial *Hymenoptera*), such I feel confident to be the case.

I propose the generic name of *Macrocolcus* as a combination of the two; by doing so *Coleocentrus* would become a synonyme, and the species would stand thus:—

Macrocoleus excitator, ♂ and ♀ .. Syn. ♀, *Coleocentrus excitator* (Grav.)

♂, *Macrus longiventris* (Grav.)

Do. *caligatus*, ♀ Syn. ♂, *Macrus* ———? (Grav.)

which is a very similar ♀; and it may be inferred, that the ♂ cannot be very different to *longiventris*, but *Macrus filiventris* ♀ (abdomen *angustissimum*) appears to be very distinct. However, I think it likely that his *M. Croceicornis* and *Soleatus* may have females similar to *M. excitator*, and would naturally class under the proposed genus; these males Gravenhorst considers varieties of one another.

Mr. Curtis, in his Guide, has *C. excitator* indicated as British. I have not seen an English specimen, but it is not improbable that it may be so, as I took, in the same place, specimens of *Sirex Gigas* and *Spectrum*. The wood consisted of rough deal planks, and floors of the same.